G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1895
~~191~~ .

(S. R)

Later references.

File No. 22 of 1895

Serial Nos. 1—22

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Part B for Feb 1898

SUBJECT.

Patiappa's case against the Ex. Commission

Countermarked

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

Indexed

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT.

Suits against the Excise Commr in Mysore filed by Patrappa, late Arrack Contractor of the Gowribidnur Circle.

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 32 dated 3rd July 95

from the Excise Commr in Mysore

The matter in dispute should have been disposed of at the outset by referring the Contractor to para 7 condition 8 of the Notification.

2. The Deputy Commr however having expressed an opinion negativing the right now put forth, of utilizing Date trees of Patrappa's Contract for Taluks in adjacent Districts, the complaint should have been settled by local enquiry and from the former Contractors. This

has not been submitted [illegible] Presumably the Plff. complains that his arrack shops were [illegible] & that thereby he sustained a loss. If there is sufficient evidence to disprove this & also to show that by [illegible], the Bangalore & Tumkur Districts had a right to draw toddy from the groves in question, the Excise Commr has a good & valid defence. He may be instructed to collect all necessary evidence & to contest the suits on the grounds mentioned in his written statements. The cases being important & the sums involved being large, the Govt Advocate may perhaps be consulted before definite orders are shaped.

10-7-95

does not appear to have been reduced to writing but was evidently only oral.

3 Para 7, Condition 8 alludes to "other Taluks" but ~~[illegible]~~ this may in the absence of proof of usage, refer to those of the Kolar District only and not Taluks in other Districts

4 The matter falls under Progs of Govt No 4668-79/Ci R0 137 Dd 25th Sept/88.

5 As a legal question is involved, begs the matter may be referred to the Govt. ~~Legislative Depart~~ Advocate for disposal.

9/7/95 S. A.

~~The contractor had only a right to the paddy required for his own crops. He had no right to sell any to other farmers.~~
A copy of the plaint

been recd. ~~[illegible]~~ from the [illegible] Govr. who may be requested to submit the same, and after consulting the Govt. advocate, necessary instructions may issue. We need not presume that Plffs. objections have been abandoned. He ~~[illegible]~~ may put forward the plea if he chooses, and prove it. Then we will have to disapprove the [illegible]

10/7/95

Submitted

Sir,

I have directed Gov: Pro: No $\frac{9725-34}{212}$ of 12th March 1890 sanctioning Pattrappas contract & connecting papers being taken up. Thi will take time -

2. I would humbly respectfully suggest the file being sent to the Dewan for perusa as the farms were sold in his own presence & he may ha given out certain conditions of which he may have kept notes or directed Mr. Ananda Row to do so -

3. The Ex: Engr should have sent up all the connecting papers in original to enable a correct opinion being formed. He had not done so -

4 - In case you think the papers ha go as they are to the

Govt. Advocate I have put up a draft for approval

15/7

L.A.J.

I would add:

4 (The plaint discloses no cause of action inasmuch as under the Notification of 25th ~~Aug~~ January 190 the Pltf was only entitled to extract toddy for sale within the limits of his own farm & he nowhere distinctly alleges that by reason of the removal of toddy by Defts 2 & 3 the supply of toddy to his own farm would be insufficient. He had no right to extract toddy or sell it for use outside the limits of his own farm)

(The principle on which the damages have been estimated is wrong - C.)

Subd.-C.
9-9-95- include in
(10)

this may be ordered: and
necessary instructions issued to
the Excise Commr. who shd.
be asked whether he wants
to engage the Public Prosecutor
[illegible] &c: or the Govt.
advocate to defend the
case on behalf of Govt.

5/9/95

The A.G.: Govt. advocate
may be appointed

10/9/95

[illegible]
[illegible]

12-9-95

Mr Macdonell:
Submit this
to the 3rd Comm-
-ittee at once — A
9/9/95

9th Septr 1895

My dear Sir [illegible]

The cases are simple but still there is nothing like precaution

The Assistt Govt Advocate knows all about the cases & I would therefore like to see them entrusted to him.

Yrs truly
P. Michelli

Gen. 30.]

189 9-JUL. 95
Ex. 5
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Submitted for orders

RS
9/7

Section	S. 2
File No	22. 95.
Serial No	1

To

Revenue
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the
Govt. *~~Dewan of~~ Mysore.*

Dated 3rd
Despatched ~~9th~~ 8th
Received
July 1895

Enclosure No. (3)

General No. 32
No. 1

~~In reply to~~

SUBJECT.

Reports that Pattappa late Toddy Contractor of the Goribednore circle, Kolar District from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892 has filed ~~Case~~ Suits against the Excise Commissioner, and solicits sanction to the costs of the suits being borne by Government

Excise
8/7/95

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Excise Commissioner's Office
Camp Malvalli 3rd July 1895.

No: 32/1 (Exc 3)

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

8

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that Patrappa, late Toddy Contractor of the Goribidnore circle consisting of the taluks of Goribednore, Chickballapur, Bagepally and Sidlaghatta in the Kolar District, for a period of two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892 has filed two suits in the District court of Nandidurg, as per particulars in the margin, making Excise Commissioner the 1st defendant.

No. 63 } Plaintiff
of 1894-95 }
Patrappa.

Defendents-
1. Excise Commissioner
2. Dodda Pappamah
No. 64 } Plaintiff
of 1894-95 }
Patrappa

Defendents
1. Excise Commissioner
2. Hottay Rungamma
3. Kenchammah.

2. The Summonses have been duly served on me, and the cases have been posted for hearing on the 23rd and 24th July 1895.

3. As gathered from the copies of the Plaints received with the summonses, the suits have been filed on the following grounds:—

(1) that Plaintiff was the Toddy Contractor of the taluks of Goribednore, Chickballapur Bagepally and Sidlaghatta taluks in the Kolar District for two years from 1st April 1890

1890. to 31st March 1892;

(2) that the date groves belonging to the above taluks were in his exclusive possession and enjoyment during the above period;

(3) that the Toddy Contractors Dodda Pappannah and Chickmalliah of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts, respectively, for the aforesaid two years, removed Toddy from certain groves in the Goribednore taluk to their respective Districts, without his consent, on the plea that it was always usual for the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts to obtain Toddy from the Goribednore taluk;

(4) that he complained about their act to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District and late Excise Commissioner Mr Vijayendra Row;

-sioner decided that the Contractors of the Bangalore and Kolar Districts had no right to draw toddy from the groves in the Goribednore taluk.

(6) but that the Excise Commissioner ordered that until he finally settled the dispute after making a local enquiry in the presence of both parties, the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts should be allowed to transport the requisite quantity of Toddy from the Goribednore taluk, an accurate account of such transports being kept by both parties;

(7) that the late Excise Commissioner Mr. Vijayendra Row, never settled the dispute, and afterwards he died.

(8)

(8) that his Successor Mr Ricketts also did not settle the dispute.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

(9) that Dodda Pappanah and Chick Malliah having obtained supplies of Toddy from the Goribednore taluk, according to the accounts maintained by both parties, he (Plaintiff) claims Rs 17493-15-6 on account of the Bangalore District, and Rs 13407-14-2 on account of the Tumkur District.

4. It is a well known fact that most of the taluks in the province are dependent for Toddy supply upon other taluks in the same District or different Districts. According to the established usage, the contractor of the Bangalore District obtained from the Goribednore taluk the requisite quantity of Toddy for the taluks of Dodballapur, Devenhalli and Hoskota, and

the Contractor of the Tumkur District likewise obtained it for the Maddigiri taluk. Patrappa, the Contractor of the Goribednore circle, complained that the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts had no right to obtain Toddy from the Goribednore taluk. The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, in his letter No. $\frac{662}{424}$, dated 2nd June 1890, reported that the right set up by the Toddy Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts to transport Toddy from the Goribednore taluk, was not one recognized by Government or established by prescription, but was only a private arrangement made by the former Contractors who had a unity of interest in all the three Districts comprised in the late Nandidrug Division. As this report was based mainly upon a

deposition taken by the Amildar of Goribednore from one Seshamah who was apparently interested in the Contractor of the Goribednore circle, the late Excise Commissioner replied to the Deputy Commissioner as follows:— "There has not been
"an enquiry on this subject in the
"presence of the parties concerned.
"The Excise Commissioner will hold
"a local enquiry on a day to be
"fixed hereafter, after consulting
"the convenience of the Contractors
"of Bangalore, Kolar and Tumkur.
"In the meantime the Contractor
"of Goribednore will, without an
"objection, permit, as during the
"late contract, the exportation of
"Toddy to Dodballapur and
"Maddigere. The point will be
"disposed of as soon as possible"

5. On the representations of the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts that it was an established custom

a transport of toddy from
Goribednore taluk, and that
they could not do without it,
the late Excise Commissioner
issued a Kanarese order to
Patappa to the following effect:—

"Until the dispute is finally
"settled the following procedure
"shall be adopted:—

(1) "The requisite Toddy shall,
"for the present, be transported
"to the Madhugiri taluk in
"the Tumkur District, and
"Dodballapur, Devanhally
"and Hoskote taluks in the
"Bangalore District

(2) "Until the settlement of
"the dispute is effected, the
"Contractor of the Goribednore
"circle shall keep an account
"showing the Toddy transported
"to the above taluks and send
"a copy of it to the Excise
"Commissioner as well as

— to

"Bangalore and Tumkur

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

"Districts.

(3) "If the dispute be decided
"in favor of Mr Patrappa,
"the amounts due to him
"shall be paid by the Con-
"tractors of the Bangalore and
"Tumkur Districts.

6. Though the late Excise Commissioner, did not make a local enquiry, yet he seems to have questioned several old c Contractors of the various Districts and satisfied himself that the supply of Toddy from the Goribednu taluk to the aforesaid taluks was of absolute necessity, that accordingly it was always transported, and that therefore it was an established usage to do so. Such usage has been followed under the present new Toddy scheme also, the requisite supplies of Toddy

for the Doddaballapur and Devenhally taluks in the Bangalore District, and the Maddagere taluk in the Tumkur District being obtained from the Goribednore taluk; but for supply of Toddy to the Hoskotā taluk, however, other arrangements have been made on account of the great distance of the date groves in the Goribednore taluq from Hoskotā. Thus it is conclusively clear that the aforesaid taluks have always been dependent upon the Goribednore taluk for supplies of Toddy.

7. It was also one of the conditions of the aforesaid two years' Toddy Contract which closed on 31st March 1892 as laid down in Condition VIII of the Toddy Contract Notification dated 25th January 1890. that the Contractor could have no claim to Compensation on account of any

date trees or topes which the Government might at any time consider necessary to preserve for the supply of Toddy to other Taluks.

8 On Patrappa presenting a petition to me in June 1893, I gave him an endorsement on the 8th July 1893, setting forth the above said grounds and stating that he could claim no compensation for the Toddy transported from the Goribednore taluk to meet the requirements of the Tumkur and Bangalore Districts.

9. Two statements setting forth the grounds of defence are herewith submitted.

10. I beg to solicit that orders may be passed for the costs of the defence, so far as the Excise Commissioner is concerned, being borne by Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
J Ricketts
Excise Commissioner

Written Statement of the 1st Defendant (Excise Commissioner) in original civil Suit No. 64 of 1894-95 on the file of the District Judge, Nundidrug Division.

---

1. It is a well known fact that all the Taluks in the Mysore Province do not contain date groves, and that therefore they are not self-supporting as regards the supply of Toddy; and that many taluks are consequently dependent for the supply of Toddy upon other taluks in the same District or different Districts.

2. Parts of the Maddigiri taluk in the Tumkur District, have always been dependent for the supply of Toddy upon the groves in the Goribidnore taluk.

3. The conditions of the Toddy Contract for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892,

referred to in the Plaint of Patrappa, are laid down in the Government notification dated 25th January 1890, from which it will be seen that the Contractor's right was *exclusive* only as regards the vend of Toddy within the respective taluks.

× A copy is herewith sent for ready reference.

4: It is not true, as alleged by Plaintiff, that Mr. Ricketts, the Excise Commissioner did not dispose of the Plaintiff's dispute. It was ascertained that the supply of Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk to the above mentioned taluk in the Tumkur District was of absolute necessity; the said taluk not being self-supporting, and that the practice of transporting Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk has therefore always existed. It is clear from the aforesaid Government notification that the Contractor was not given the exclusive privilege of tapping *all* the trees in the Garibidnur taluk. As laid down in condition VIII in para 7 of the said Notification, the Government had full liberty at any time to reserve the date trees in any taluk for the supply of Toddy to other Taluks. Accordingly, the Excise Commissioner as the representative of Government. allowed Toddy to be drawn from the Groves in the Goribidnur taluk, referred to by the Plaintiff for supply to the aforesaid taluk in the Tumkur District. As per condition VIII, the Plaintiff is not entitled to any compensation on account of the Toddy transported from the said groves. Accordingly the Excise Commissioner passed his decision in his official memo No $\frac{124}{8}$ dated 8th July 1893, and communicated the same to Plaintiff Patrappah, a copy whereof is herewith appended.

5. Under the above circumstances the undersigned submits that the suit deserves to be dismissed with costs.

Excise Commissioner,
Mysore

No: 124/8

Excise Commissioner's Office
Dated 8th/11 July 1893.

16

Official Memorandum

Read: —

Petition No: 65, dated 20th June 1893, from Mr: Patrappa, late Toddy Contractor, Gowribidnoor circle Kolar District, for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892.

1. The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District in his letter No: 662/424, dated 2nd June 1890, reported to the effect that the right set up by the Toddy Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts to transport toddy from the Gowribidnoor Taluq, was not one recognized by Govt: or established by prescription, but was only a private arrangement made by the former Contractors who had a unity of interest in all the three Districts comprised in the late Nundidroog Division. As this report was based mainly upon a deposition taken by the Amildar

of Goribidnoor from one Seshamma who was apparently interested in the Contractor of the Kolar District, the Excise Commr replied to the Deputy Commr as follows: "There has not been an enquiry on this subject in the presence of the parties concerned. The Excise Commr will hold a local enquiry on a day to be fixed hereafter, after consulting the convenience of the Contractors of Bangalore, Kolar and Tumkur. In the meantime the Contractor of Goribidnoor will, without objection permit as during the late contract the exportation of Toddy to Doddaballapur and Maddagiri. The point will be disposed of as soon as possible".

2. On the representations of the Contractors of the Tumkur and Bangalore Districts that it was an established custom to transport toddy from the Goribidnoor Taluk and that they could not do without it, the Excise Commr issued a Canarese order to Mr Patrappa to the following effect:—

"Until the dispute is finally settled,

the following procedure shall be observed: —

(1) The requisite toddy shall for the present, be transported to the Maddagiri Taluk in the Tumkur District and Doddaballapur — Devanhully and Hoskote Taluks in the Bangalore District.

(2) Until the settlement of the dispute is effected, the Contractor of the Goribidnore Circle shall keep an account, showing the toddy transported to the above taluks, and send a copy of it to the Excise Commr as well as to the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur districts.

(3) If the dispute be decided in favor of Mr Patrappa, the amounts due to him, shall be paid by the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts."

3. Though the late Excise Commr did not make a local enquiry, he seems to have questioned several old Contractors of the various Districts and satisfied himself that the supply of Toddy from the Goribidnore Taluk to the aforesaid taluks, was of absolute

necessity. The Special Officers who were appointed last year to carry out the new Toddy Scheme, found it necessary to transport toddy from the Goribidnore Taluk to the Maddagiri Taluk in the Tumkur District and Doddaballapur and Devanhalli Taluks in the Bangalore District. Accordingly, toddy is now being transported to the above taluks from the Goribidnore Taluk; but for the supply of toddy to the Hoskota Taluk other arrangements have been made on account of the great distance of the date groves in the Goribidnore Taluk from Hoskota. Thus it is clear that the aforesaid taluks have always been dependent upon the Goribidnore Taluk, for supplies of toddy.

4: As laid down in Condition VIII of the Toddy Contract Notification dated 25th January 1890, the Contractor could have no claim to compensation on account of any date trees or topes which the Government might, at any time, consider necessary to reserve for the supply of Toddy to other Taluks.

5. Under such circumstances, Mr. Patrappa can claim no compensation for the toddy transported from the Goribidnore Taluk to meet the requirements of the Tumkur and Bangalore Districts.

(Signed) L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To, Mr. Patrappa.

"Copy"
L Ricketts
Excise Commr.

BS

16
c

Written Statement of the 1st Defendant (Excise Commissioner) in original Civil Suit No: 63 of 1894-95 on the file of the District Judge, Nundidrug Division.

1. It is a well known fact that all the Taluks in the Mysore province do not contain date groves, and that therefore they are not self-supporting as regards the supply of Toddy; and that many taluks are consequently dependent for the supply of Toddy upon other taluks in the same District or different Districts.

2. The taluks of Dodballapur and Devanhalli and parts of the Hoskota taluk have always been dependent for the supply of Toddy upon the groves in the Goribidnur taluk.

3. The conditions of the Toddy Contract for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892, referred to in

the plaint of Patrappan, as se down in the Government Notification× dated 25th January 1890, from which it will be seen that the Contractor's right was exclusive only as regards the vend of Toddy within the respective taluks.

×A copy is herewith sent for ready reference.

[illegible]

4. It is not true, as alleged by Plaintiff, that "Mr. Ricketts, the Excise Commissioner" did not dispose of the Plaintiff's dispute. It was ascertained that the supply of Toddy from the Goribidnore taluk to the above mentioned taluks in the Bangalore District, was of absolute necessity, the said taluks not being self-supporting; and that the practice of transporting Toddy from the Goribidnore taluk has therefore always existed. It is clear from the aforesaid Government Notification that the Contractor was not given the exclusive privilege of tapping all the trees in the Goribidnore taluk

taluk. As laid down in Condition VIII in para 7 of the said Notification, the Government had full liberty at any time to reserve the date trees in any taluk for the supply of Toddy to other taluks. Accordingly, the Excise Commissioner, as the representative of Government, allowed Toddy to be drawn from the Groves in the Goribidnore taluk, referred to by the Plaintiff, for supply to the aforesaid taluks in the Bangalore District. As per said Condition VIII, the Plaintiff is not entitled to any compensation on acount of the Toddy transported from the said Groves. Accordingly, the Excise Commissioner passed his decision in his Official Memo No: $\frac{124}{8}$, dated 8th July 1893, and communicated the same to Plaintiff Patrappah, a copy whereof is herewith appended.

5. Under the above circumstances, the undersigned submits that the suit deserves to be dismissed with costs.

S Ricketts

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

No. 124/8 Excise Commissioner's Office

Bangalore dated 8th/11 July/93

Official Memorandum

Read:-

Petition No. 65, dated 20th June 1893, from Mr. Patrappah, late Toddy Contractor, Goribidnur Circle, Kolar District, for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892.

---

1. The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, in his letter No. 662/424, dated 2d June 1890 reported to the effect that the right set up by the Toddy contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts to transport Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk, was not one recognized by Government or established by prescription, but was only a private arrangement made by the former contractor who had a unity of interest in all the three Districts comprised in the late Nundidroog Division. As this report was based mainly upon a deposition taken by the Amildar of Goribidnur from one Seshamma who was apparently interested in the Contractor of the Kolar District, the Excise Commissioner replied to the Deputy Commissioner as follows:

there has not been an enquiry on this subject in the presence of the parties concerned. The Excise Commissioner will hold a local enquiry on a day to be fixed hereafter, after consulting the convenience of the Contractors of Bangalore, Kolar and Tumkur. In the meantime the Contractor of Goribidnur will, without objection, permit as during the late Contract, the exportation of Toddy to Doddaballapur and Maddagiri. The point will be disposed of as soon as possible".

2. On the representations of the Contractors of the Tumkur and Bangalore Districts that it was an established custom to transport Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk, and that they could not do without it, the Excise Commissioner issued a Kanarese order to Mr. Patrappah to the following effect:-

"Until the dispute is finally settled, the following procedure shall be observed:-

(1) The requisite toddy shall, for the present, be transported to the Maddagiri Taluk in the Tumkur District and Doddaballapur, Devanhally and Hoskota Taluks in the Bangalore District.

(2) Until the settlement of the dispute is effected, the Contractor of the Goribidnur

circle shall keep an account, showing the Toddy transported to the above taluks, and send a copy of it to the Excise Commissioner as well as to the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts.

(3) If the dispute be decided in favour of Mr. Patrappah, the amount due to him, shall be paid by the Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts".

3. Though the late Excise Commissioner did not make a local enquiry, he seems to have questioned several old Contractors of the various Districts and satisfied himself that the supply of toddy from the Goribidnur Taluk to the aforesaid taluks, was of absolute necessity. The Special Officers who were appointed last year to carry out the new Toddy Scheme found it necessary to transport Toddy from the Goribidnur Taluk to the Maddagiri taluk in the Tumkur District and Doddaballapur and Devanhalli taluks in the Bangalore District. Accordingly, toddy is now being transported to the above taluks from the Goribidnur taluk; but for the supply of toddy to the Hoskota taluk other arrange

ments have been made on account of the great distance of the Date groves in the Goribidnur taluk from Hoskota. Thus it is clear that the aforesaid taluks have always been dependent upon the Goribidnur Taluk for supplies of Toddy.

4. As laid down in Condition VIII of the Toddy Contract Notification dated 25th January 1890, the Contractor could have no claim to compensation on account of any Date trees or topes which the Government might, at any time, consider necessary to reserve for the supply of toddy to other taluks.

5. Under such circumstances, Mr Patrappah can claim no compensation for the toddy transported from the Goribidnur taluk to meet the requirements of the Tumkur and Bangalore Districts.

(Sd) L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To Mr Patrappah

"Copy"
L Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Section S-R
File No 22-1895
Serial No 2

The Excise Commr
in Mysore

Dy 11th July/95

No 457/Ex 12.   En:

His letter No 32 Dy 3rd July/95 reporting that Patrappa late Toddy Contractor of the Gowribidnur Circle of the Kolar Distt has filed suits against him.

In reply, has the honor to request that the Excise Commr will be good enough to submit copies of the plaints in the suits above referred to with a view to the Govt Advocate being consulted as laid down in para 5 of Govt Procs No 4668-79/Cir 137 Dy 25th Sept/88, after which necessary instructions will issue.

B.O.

11-7-95
Rev Secy

11/7

3

Section S. R

File No 22—95

Serial No 3

18

From

Urgent

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT, DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Gl. 314
ex-11
1 JUL. 95

To

Revenue

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the

Govt ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 13th
Despatched
Received
} July 1895

Enclosure No. 4

General No. 129

No. 10

In reply to Revenue Secretary's No $\frac{457}{Ex12}$, dated $\frac{11}{12}$ instant.

SUBJECT.

Forwards copies of Patrappa's Plaint.

R. Excise

Submit soon

15-7-95

Copy to Govt Advocate for favour of early opinion

16-7-95

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Excise Commissioner's office
No. 129/10 (Enc 4) Camp Bannur 13th July 1895

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 457/Ex 12, dated 4/12th instant, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copies of Patiappa's Plaints.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
W. Vinicombe Davy
For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

M. S.

Section P.R
File No 22-1895
Serial No 4

The Govt Advocate
Bangalore

Dd 16th July 95

No $\frac{60}{Ex/15}$

En: 7

Has the honor to forward herewith Excise Commr's letter No $\frac{32}{1}$ Dd 3rd July 95 with its enclosures and copies of the plaints since received in re suits brought by Patrappa, late Toddy Contractor, Goribidnur Circle against the Excise Commr in Mysore, and to request the favour of its early return with his opinion thereon as laid down in para 5 of Govt Procgs No $\frac{4668-79}{Ci\,137}$ Dd 25th Sept 1888.

B.O.

16/7/95

Rev Secy

15/7/95

1888.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

JUDICIAL.

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 25*th September* 1888.

No. 4668-79.
Cir. No. 137.

Rules for the conduct of suits filed against Government officers.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—8-11-88.—150.

Proceedings of the Dewan to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Judicial),—dated 25th September 1888.

No. 4668-79—Cir. 137, dated Bangalore, 25th September 1888.

Order.—In *re* suits against Government officers against their proceedings as Government officers, the following rules are prescribed for their information and guidance :—

1. On receipt of notice under Section 424 of the Civil Procedure Code from parties intending to file suits against Government officers, the latter shall at once send for the records of the case which gave rise to the complaint and satisfy themselves as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the threatened action.

2. If, after careful examination of the case, the complaint be found reasonable, the officer concerned shall, if he has jurisdiction and is otherwise competent to do so, grant at once the redress sought for. If the granting of the redress he considers reasonable, be not within his jurisdiction, he shall at once apply to Government for orders.

3. If, however, the complaint be frivolous and not based upon any right, he will collect information for conducting the defence, but will, at the same time, submit to Government for its information a report of the case.

4. The reports to Government to be submitted under paras 2 and 3 above must be brief, but should contain a clear statement of the facts and law at issue, with the officer's opinion upon the same, and be accompanied by a copy of the order complained of. They should reach the Government at least a whole fortnight before the expiry of the two months allowed by Section 424, Civil Procedure Code

5. On receipt of summons from Courts giving formal notice of the suit, the officer concerned shall, whenever the time fixed for answering the plaint is insufficient, obtain an extension of the same (genearlly for 3 months from date of service of summons) under Section 423, Civil Procedure Code, and shall, at the same time, submit the case for the orders of the Government. The reference should refer to previous correspondence with, and orders of Government, if any, on the subject of the suit, and be accompanied by the draft of the written statement which the officer sued may propose to file, together with brief arguments in support of each ground. The Government Advocate will thereupon be consulted by Government in all important or doubtful cases. The report under this para should reach the Dewan's office at least a whole month before the date fixed for the hearing of the suit.

6. Similarly early intimation of adverse decrees shall be given to Government to decide in consultation with the Government Advocate as to further proceedings in higher courts.

7. The conduct of the defence shall, in Districts where there are Government Prosecutors who are at the same time enrolled Pleaders of the Chief Court, be entrusted to them; in other Courts, to the best local Pleader.

8. In complicated cases requiring greater experience and legal knowledge, the services of the Government Advocate may be applied for through Government.

9. The remuneration for the conduct of the defence shall ordinarily be the maximum amount calculated according to rates of costs of the suit assessable by the Court, together with such additional sum as may be fixed by Government in each case upon the report of the officer under para 5 above. Where the Pleaders may have to travel to put in appearance in the Courts, travelling allowance at the rate of three rupees a day or a mileage at six annas will be passed.

10. It must be distinctly understood that the Government are not bound to defray the costs of the defence in all suits. The officers concerned must undoubtedly bear them where their proceedings have been condemned as irregular and quite opposed to law, or to the standing Order of Government or the established practice of the Department concerned.

R. VIJAYINDRA RAO,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.
The Public Prosecutors of Mysore and Shimoga.
The Registrar, Chief Court.
The Government Advocate.

Recd Excise
21
19/7/95

Section	P.R
File No	22-95
Serial No	5

(General Serial No. 30.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
Gl. No. 488
No. Ex 24
189 20 JUL. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

20

From The Assistant Govt. advocate
Bangalore

To
The ~~Chief~~ Revenue Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govert.
of Mysore.

Sir

Dated 19th july 1895

Despatched 19th july 1895

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 8
No.

In reply to your letter No. 607/No. Ex 15, I have the honour to state that the Cases are important and further they are Complicated and, as I have to Send for and refer to Some papers mentioned in the Exsise Commissioner's letter to the Government and as I have to take instructions from some one in the Exsise Department fully acquianted with the Cases, befor I can express my Opinion and Submit draft written Statements, I request that the Exsise Commissioner may be requested to apply for an adjournment of the Cases to some date in October from 23rd & 24th July to which dates the Cases are now posted for Settlement issues.

S Ramaswamy
Assistant Govt. advocate

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Section S-R
File No 22-95
Serial No 6

21

The Excise Comr
in Mysore

D/ 20th July 95

No 806/SR 21

En: 1

In forwarding herewith Copy of letter No 8 Dt 19th Inst from the Asst Govt Advocate in re suits brought by Patrappa against the Excise Comr in Mysore as reported in the references in the marg

correspondence ending with Ex: Comr's No 129/10 Q 13/7/95

has the honor to request that the Excise Comr will be good enough to ~~ask~~ apply for an adjournment of the cases to some date in Oct as requested & arrange with the Govt Advocate to afford him the help needed"

20-7-95

Rev: Secy

S. H. 20/7

(6)

1895

(22)

Section P. R
File No 22-95
Serial No. 7

To

The Assistt. Govt. Advocate
Bangalore.

Dated 23rd July 1895.
Despd.

No. $\frac{980}{Ex\ 34}$ En: 11

His letter no: 8 dated 19th July 1895.

---

x. I Govt. Procs. $\frac{9725-34}{212}$ d/ 12/3/90.
II From Bangalore Dy. Commr. No. 824 d/ 26/2/90.
III From Dy. Commr. Tumkur Distt. No. 891 d/ 3/3/90.
IV From Dy. Commr. Kolar Distt. No. $\frac{3250}{1884}$ d/ 28/2/90
V From Dy. Commr. Hassan Distt. No. $\frac{99}{5}$ d/ 16/5/90
VI Govt. Order No. $\frac{5102}{152}$ d/ 11/8/90.
VII From Dy. Commr. Hassan Distt. No. $\frac{345}{5}$ d/ 25/9/90 with enclos:
VIII Chief Secy's Nos. 386 & 387 d/ 8/10/90
IX From Dy. Commr. Hassan Distt. No. $\frac{386}{5}$ d/ 19/10/90
X Govt. Order No. $\frac{13471}{374}$ d/ 2/3/91.

In reply, has the honor to ~~enclose~~ forward for information copy of this office docket no $\frac{806}{Ex:21}$ d/ 20th July 1895 to the Excise Commissioner in Mysore ~~and to append the original papers in this office as noted in the margin x (for perusal and return when no longer required) connected with the two cases of the Toddy Contract in question.~~

re suits filed by Patrabba.

The marginally noted papers are also forwarded for reference & return when no longer required

By Order
Rev: Secretary

23/7/95

Submitted for orders. The Lists alluded to are not on the files — & must have been taken away by the tenderers for reference. It is very doubtful if the Toddy Contractors, under the old system, were in a position to furnish, at so short a notice, lists of the stamps indicated as they did not work the farms themselves but had 3 or 4 intermediatories & only the last could practically tell how the case stood.

5/9/95 S. H. I.

[illegible]

6/9/95

Ex/ Written to write again a reminder — S.H.I.
6/9

The Dewan's Home Office can't trace the Lists — May the G/ord. be told so?
10/9 S. H. I.

Exise.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
1895 Gl. No. 1673
Br. No. 115
29 AUG. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

23

From
The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To
The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore, Revenue ~~Dept.~~

Dated 28th
Despatched 29 } August 1895.
Received

General No. 1013
No. 105
Enclosure No.

In reply to Revenue Secretary's Letter No. 806/Ex. 21 dated 20-7-95.

SUBJECT

Requests to be furnished with all the original lists showing the sources of Toddy supply to each taluk prepared & submitted to the Dewan by each tenderer for the Toddy Contracts of Several Districts which closed on 31st March 1892.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Excise
By
29/8/95

(10)

Fr 3/9/95

No. 1013/105 Excise Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore, dated 27th August 1895.

29

23

Section S.R.
File No 22-95
Serial No 8

From
The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To
The Revenue Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 806/Ex: 21 dated 20th July 1895, I have the honor to request to be furnished with all the original lists showing the Sources of Toddy supply to each taluk, prepared and submitted to the Dewan in person by each tenderer for the Toddy Contracts of the several Districts which closed on 31st March 1892 at the time of disposing of all the tenders.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
J. Ricketts,

Ex: Clerk Prep. Sheet
[illegible]9/95
S. A.

Submitted to the Pro: Secy: for orders
The case is posted to 14th Instant
S. A.
5/9/95

See rules for [illegible]
[illegible]

Section S. R.
File No. 22 - 1895
Serial No. 9

(General Serial No. 80.) Gl. No. 1783
Gl 118

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
189 3 SEP. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

From The Assistant Government Advocate in Mysore

24

To Revenue
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Government of Mysore.

Dated 30th August 1895

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 & 2 files

General No. 37
No.

Submitting Draft written Statements in re Patharappa v. Excise Commissioner in Mysore.
to be heard on the 14th September 1895 before the District Court of Bangalore.

R(Exc)
Abh

2/3
5/9/95
(9) 3/9/95

Assistant Govt Advocate's Office
30th August 1895

No 37

Enc: No 2 & 2 files of Correspondence as per list.

24

From

The Assistant Govt Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letters Nos $\frac{607}{S4\ 15}$ & $\frac{980}{S4\cdot 34}$, dated 16th & 23rd ultimo respectively I have the honor to enclose herein Drafts of 2 written Statements to be filed after approval. The cases stand adjourned to the 14th Proximo.

2. The enclosures (in original) received with the above are herewith returned as per list.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Asstt Govt Advocate

1895

Section S-R
File No 22-1895
Serial No 10

From

26
Not urgent

To

The Asst. Govt. Advocate
Bangalore

Dated & Despatched } 12th Sept 1895 / 12
Received

General No. 3040
No. Ex 89

Enclosure No. one file of papers with list & two written statements.

Letter No: 37 of 30th Aug 95 enclosing two draft written statements to be filed in the two cases in re

Patrappa
Vs.
Excise Commr. in Mysore.

The draft written statements ~~sent~~ forwarded with the above are approved with certain slight modifications & ~~with the exception of the amendments made in red ink~~ ~~and are~~ herewith returned.

2. Government desire

that the Asst. Govt. Advocate
~~[illegible]~~ for,
will appear ~~for conducting the~~
~~cases, and report~~ the result
~~being reported~~
in due course. -

appear for the accused & conduct ~~the~~ case on his behalf;

3. The papers received are herewith returned vide List.

By Order.

Revenue Secretary

No. 3041 / Ex. 90

1. Copy to the Excise Commr. for information and guidance.

2. The original lists showing the sources of Ivory supply as called for in No. 1013/105 of 28/8/95 are not forthcoming in this office

~~J. Olive~~
S. R.
12/9

Gen. 31.]

1896

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
Section S.R
File No 22-95
Serial No 11

27

From

To The Asst. Govt. Advocate
Bangalore

Dated 23/1/96
Despatched 28
Received

General No. 6674
No. Ex 207

Enclosure No.

This Office Docket
No. 3040 E:89 of the
12th September 1895

=

Adverting to the correspondence ending with the above has the honor to request the return of the papers sent in connection with the case brought by Mr Patsappa against the Excise Commr., if not filed in Court & if no longer needed as they are required

Requested for Reference

B. G

HCh
23/1
Under Secy

S. A.
21/1/96

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

Gl. No. 6174
Gu No. 328
1 FEB.
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

28

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~
Government *of Mysore.*
Revenue & General Deptts

Dated 14th February 1896

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 files as per list

General No. 119
No.

Forwarding files of papers in re Pattarappah vs Excise Commissioner & requesting that the same may be returned to him as the case stands adjd to 11th March for Issues.

Rev: Deptt
Sugd 15/2/96 X X
Excise Branch.

15/2/96

Return the papers

Government Advocate's Office
14th February 1896

No. 119

Enc: 2 files as per list

Section S-R J
File No 22-95
Serial No 12

28

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
Revenue & General Departments

Sir,

With reference to letter No. 6674 / Ex: 207 dated 23rd Ultimo from the Revenue Secretary, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of papers in re O.S. Nos 63 & 64 of 1894-95 on the file of the District Judge of Nundidroog Division

Pothrappah. Plaintiff.
Vs.
Excise Commissioner & others.

As the case stands adjourned for Settlement of Issues to the 11th March 1896, I request that the file may be returned to me when no longer required.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Government Advocate

Section S-R
File No 22-95
Serial No 13

29

To

The Government Advoca
in Mysore.

No 7780 / Ex. 231. d 26.2.96.
2/3

in 2 files.

His letter No. 119 dated the 14th Inst. forwarding file of papers in re Patrappa's vs Excise Commr Latters.

As requested in the above, the file of papers therewith received are returned. ~~and~~ They may be sent back when done with

R.O.
26/2
Secretary.

The Govt. advocate may be asked to produce the said pros before the Distt. Judge on the required date.

12/2/97

Gl. No. 5329 / Ex 292 / 189 FEB. 97

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 6804 8 FEB 1897 mis 2089

From The District Judge Nandidrug Dn.

30

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

________ Dept.

Section S.R

File No 22–95

Serial No. 14

Dated 4-2-97

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Forwarding summons to produce Public Documents.

Transferred to Rev Dept

10/2

Patappa to Excise Comr

In this case, Govt Pro: 9775-34 of 212 12.3.90 is required to be produced before the Court of the Distt. Judge, Nandidrug Dn) on or before 2d. March 1897

The Doct. is with the Govt. Advocate

Submitted for orders

12/2/97

Genl. Record. Putrh refs.

References to be marked. 10/2

Procgs cited in the summons with connected papers were put up with Excise Commrs no $\frac{129}{10}$ d/ 13/7/95.

10/2/97

10/2

To. Excise Branch for kindly putting up refces.

The pros quoted together with

The office cannot have given me some informa-tion as to the nature or contents of the

10/2

Section S.R.
File No 22-95
Serial No 15

The Dy. Commr. Nandidroog Dn.

No. C. 283 Exn
Dt 1-3-97 1.

Has the honor to return the summons issued to the undersigned in O.S. No. 64 of 1894-95 (Patrappa v. Excise Commr.), with the remark that the undersigned is unable, without further time being allowed, to produce or transmit the Procs. of Govt. ~~No. [illegible]~~ therein referred to, in time for the hearing before the Court.

1/3/97.
for Secy.

Note.
This paper was given me by Mr. Ramarao this morning. As there is no time to obtain the orders of the Secy, ~~[illegible]~~, the above will be issued & ~~and~~ subd. to the Secy. as soon as possible after issue.
1/3/97.

The Procs. referred to ~~[illegible]~~ simply sanction Patrappa's ~~[illegible]~~ contract; and there is nothing apparently to prevent their production in Court by the Govt. Advocate, who has now their custody. But, as the hearing is for tomorrow and the Secy. had not recorded his orders, the above draft has been issued. The Procs are not mentioned in the Monthly volumes. Subd. to Secy.
1/3/97

This is not a satisfactory reply. I do not know why the ~~Revenue Board~~ papers were lying in the Revenue so long. Instead of sending this reply, I should have telegraphed to the Govt. Advocate asking him ~~whether there~~ to comply with the summons if there was nothing to prevent ~~[illegible]~~ such compliance. A D.O. may now be ~~written~~ to the Govt. advocate to this effect.

S. R.

R. No. 22—95

Serial No. 6

G
6/3/97

(General Serial No. 30.)

DEWAN OF MYSORE
1897
8/3/97
2347

Sir
The case No. 283 Ex dated 1/3/97 is not in the G. Branch, may this be transferred to the Excise Branch of the Rev. Dept.

7/3/97.

Please [illegible]

HO
10/3/97

From The District Judge
Nundydroog Division

5927 Ex 321

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 4th
Despatched 5th
Received 6
March 1897.

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 2140
No. 458

His No: C 283 Ex: dated 1st Instant.

In returning the summons received with the above, has the honor to intimate that the case referred to has been adjourned to 22nd June 1897, and to request that the Proceedings therein referred to may kindly be caused to be produced

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—4-9-95.—5,652.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

before this court on that date.

CCress

District Judge

F.A.

Class.
(in full.)

Number.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Receipt for an Inland Telegram.

To
(Office)

Date Stamp of Post Office

Cost *Rs.* *As.*

Extra charges Reply, Delivery, &c. *Rs.* *As.*

Initials of Postmaster, &c.

Above particulars, giving full cost, to be filled up when the Telegram is paid for, PARTLY or WHOLLY, in Postage Stamps or Reply Passes.

SPACE FOR UPPER HALVES OF TELEGRAPH STAMP.

N.B.—When Telegraph Stamps form only PART PAYMENT, the anti stamps must be fixed lengthways BELOW the dotted line.

Telegraph Stamps are accepted at all Offices. Postage Stamps are onl accepted at Post Offices and when telegrams are posted to a Telegraph Offic for transmission.

For* INLAND TELEGRAMS *only.

Stamps cut, torn or in any way defaced cannot be accepted.

SPACE FOR LOWER HALVES OF TELEGRAPH STAMPS OR FOR ENTIRE POSTAGE STAMPS.

N.B.—Stamps may be affixed along this line up to the left of the forn and continued on the corresponding space on the back, if necessary.

Code Class.	*No.*	*Words.*	*Day.*	*H.*	*M.*	*Official Instructions.*

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN BY THE SENDER ABOVE THIS LINE EXCEPT, HIS OFFICIAL INSTRUCTIO

To
(Telegraph Office) Bangalore
(Person) Government Advocate,
(Address) (in fu Bangalere.

ADDRESS FREE

From
(Telegraph Office) Mysore
(Person) Secretary

Here write whether your telegram is State *or* Private. *Unless classed* State *by sender, it will be sent as* Private, *and no change or refund is afterwards admissible.* Private

Here write whether your telegram is to be sent URGENT, ORDINARY or DEFERRED. Ordinary

Patrappa's	case	produce	tomorrow
Proceedings	12th	March	90.
if	no	objection	

NOTHING TO BE WRITTEN ON THE BACK.—CONTINUE ON ANOTHER FORM.

Sent to *LN.*
At *Hrs.* *Mts. by*

Sender's Signature and Address or Designation (Not signalled.)

The *ACCURACY* of telegrams is not guaranteed: the sender must accept *ALL RISKS* arising from non-delivery, errors or delays.

Address any complaint regarding this telegram to the Telegraph Check Office, Calcutta, within two months from the date of the telegram, enclosing this receipt.

For detailed rules, see the Telegraph Guide (price 4 annas.)

DDITIONAL SPACE FOR STAMPS.

N.B.—When Telegraph Stamps are affixed here, the upper halves, if they ac receipt, must be aced above the dotted line.

No Stamps to be affixed below unless spaces allotted are insufficient.

No 181/391

Summons to produce
Public documents.

Section 137, C. P. C.
Form No. 65, Civil.

IN THE COURT OF the District Judge Nandidroog Division Bang

32/a

Original Suit No. 64 of 94-95.

B. Patrappa Contractor } Plaintiff.

1. Excise Commissioner & others } Defendant.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Rev: & Genl Depar

Whereas it appears to this Court that a perusal of the undermentioned paper now in your custody, will tend to elucidate the facts of the suit (~~or appeal~~) now before this Court, you are hereby requested to cause the said papers to be produced in this Court, or to transmit the said papers to this Court on or before Feb 22nd ~~2nd~~ on behalf of Plaintiff.

Proceedings No. 9725-34/212 of 12th March 1895

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT
NUNDIDROOG
DIVISION

Bangalore, dated 4-2-97.

Central Jail Press. Bangalore.—11-11-93.—2,052.

Dy
C. Ramaswami
Sheristadar

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Mysore
5 March 1897

My dear Mr. Ramaswami Iyer,

In O.S. No. 64 of 1894-95 on the file of the ~~District~~ Judge, Nandidroog Dt. (Patappa versus Excise Comm. and others), a summons has been received for the production of Govt. Procs. No. $\frac{9725-34}{212}$ dt. 12 March 1890 on or before the 20 March 1897. These Procs., I find, are now with you along with other papers connected with the case; ~~and~~ a reply has been given to the Court to express inability to produce the same without further time being granted.

I am, however, now asked to request you to comply with the summons if in your opinion there is nothing to prevent such compliance.

I am yours sincerely
5/3/97

dft as per order

Section S.R
File No 22-95
Serial No 17

To

The District ~~Magte~~
Judge
Nandidroog Dn.
Bangalore

No 8276/Ex: 311

Dated 22nd March/97
24

Has docket no 2140/458 of the 4th Instant ~~re~~ forwarding summons for the production of Govt. pros no 9725-34 ~~[illegible]~~ 212 of 12/3/90 in connection with O.S. no 64 of 94-95 (Patrappa vs Excise Commr. ~~In returning herewith the summons received with the above~~, Has the honor to ~~inform~~ state that the Government Advocate has been instructed to produce the Govt. pros. referred to, ~~together with other records in question~~, on the adjourned date of hearing, subject to all reasonable objections.

"B.O."

22/3/97
Secretary

26/3/97

No. 8277/Ex: 312 d 22/3/97
24

Copy forwarded to the Government Advocate for information & guidance

"B.O."

Section S.R
File No. 22-95
Serial No. 18

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 8661
2523
Jun. 97
DEWAN'S OFFICE
189

From
The District Judge
Nandidroog Division
Bangalore

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General & Revenue Deptmt.

Dated 23rd June/97
Despatched
Received

35

General No. 3067
No. 592

Enclosure No. One Summons in O.S. No. 64 of 94-95. Patrappa vs Ex. Com: contractors [illegible]

Forwarding certain summons in duplicate for transmitting certain Proceedings on or before the 1st July/97.

K Ellis

Ref
VL
26/6/97

References to be marked.

Draft Subs.
RB
26/6/97

No. 3067/592 Rev. 1.

Rd 26/6/97

Summons to produce
Public documents.

Section 137, C. P. C.
Form No. 65, Civil.

585
14/6/97

IN THE COURT OF the District Judge Nandidroog Division Bangalore

Original Suit No. 64 of 94-95

B. Patrappa Contractor } Plaintiff.

35/a

/ Excise Commissioner & others. } Defendant.s

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue and General department.

whereas it appears to this Court that a perusal of the undermentioned papers, now in your custody, will tend to elucidate the facts of the suit (~~or appeal~~) now before this Court, you are hereby requested to cause the said papers to be produced in this Court, or to transmit the said papers to this Court on or before. 1st July 97.

on behalf of Plaintiff.

proceedings No 9725-34/212 of 12th March 1890.

Dated 23rd June 1897.

By order

Sheristadar

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—11-11-93.—2,052.

No. 3067/5-97

Summons to produce
Public documents.

Section 137, C. P. C.
Form No. 65, Civil.

IN THE COURT OF the District Judge Nandidroog Divn. Bangalore

35/6

Original Suit No. 64 of 94–95.

B. Patrappa Contractor } Plaintiff.

1. Excise Commissioner & others } Defendants.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue and General Department.

Whereas it appears to this Court that a perusal of the undermentioned papers now in your custody, will tend to elucidate the facts of the suit (~~or appeal~~) now before this Court, you are hereby requested to cause the said papers to be produced in this Court, or to transmit the said papers to this Court on or before 1st July 97, on behalf of plaintiff —

Proceedings No. 9725—34/212 d/12th March 1890

By order

C. Ramaswami Naidu

Ag. Sheristadar

Dated 23rd June 1897.

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—11-11-93.—2,052.

Draft [illegible]

36

To

Section S. R
File No. 22—95
Serial No. 19

The District Judge
Nandidroog Division
Bangalore

No 11477 / Ex: 416.

Dated ~~28~~ 28 June 97.

~~His~~ no 3067 / 592 ~~dated~~ of the 23rd Instant ~~forwarding a~~ being the summons for the production of Govt Pros no 9725–34 / 212 of 12/3/90 in connection with O.S. ~~no 64~~ no 64 of 94–95. (Pabrappa ~~VS~~ Excise Commr).

With reference to the above has the honor to draw the attention of the ~~to draw his attention~~ the District Judge to this Office docket no 8276 / Ex 311 of 22/3/97, ~~in which he was informed that~~ ~~wherein~~ and to ~~state~~ add that the Govt advocate ~~has been~~ ~~to~~ will again be instructed to produce the Pros referred to, on the adjourned date of hearing (1st 2nd weeks) subject to all reasonable objections.

"B. O."
[illegible] 28/6/97
Secretary

The Govt [illegible] in Kanarese [illegible] the 22nd June – [illegible] to [illegible] on 1st July [illegible]
I have altered the draft.
[illegible] 28/6/97

[illegible] 26/6/97 Copy to

No 11478
Ex 417

Copy forwarded to the Govt Advocate for early ~~Compl~~ attention in continuation of this office no 8277/Ex 312 dated 22nd March/97.

"B O"

28/6/97

for Secretary

SPR
No. 2 2-95
Serial No. 20

389

From The Govt. Advocate in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Genl. & Rev. Depts

Dated 10th Jany/98

Despatched

Received

General No. 119
No.

Enclosure No.

Reporting that two Civil suits filed against the Excise Commr. in Mysore in the Court of the Dt. Judge, Nundidrug Dt., have been dismissed with costs.

Excise

17/1/98. References to be marked.

Recd. 14/1/98 Subd.

May this be recorded with the remarks that the Commissioner [illegible] [illegible] ([illegible] [illegible]) will be [illegible].

Yes. 19/1/98.

15/1/98

Draft [illegible]
29/1/98

Office of the Government Advocate
in Mysore

No. 119 GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE Bangalore 10th January
1896

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 980/Ex:39, dated 23rd July 1895, I have the honor to report that the two Civil Suits Nos. 63 & 64 of 1894-95 filed by one Pathrappa, against the Excise Commissioner in Mysore in the Court of the District Judge, Nundidroog Division, have been dismissed with Costs this day.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servt.

S Ramaswamier

Draft for app[illegible]

For [illegible] & sent to Judl Branch on 24/1/1898

Section S. R
File No 22-95
Serial No 21

Read:-

Letter No 119 dated 10th January 1898, from the Govt Advocate, reporting that the two Civil Suits filed by one Patrappa against the Excise Commr in Mysore in the Court of the Dist Judge, Nundidroog Dn, have been dismissed with costs.

Order Memo - No $\frac{7016}{Ex 249}$ d 27th Jan 1898 / 27

Recorded with the observation that the re-submission of the records forwarded by ~~of~~ this office will be awaited

24/1/98
for Secretary

20/1/98

To

The Govt Advocate
in Mysore

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

5754

189

Section S. R.
File No 22—95
Serial No 22

From

The Govt: Advocate in Mysore

39

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Genl + Rev. Depts

Dated 5th Feby/98

Despatched

Received

General No. 137
No.

Enclosure No. one file of corresp:dce

Forwarding the entire file of correspondence (Recd: connected with the suits filed by one Patrappa against the Excise Commr in Mysore

---

References to be marked.

Subd.

This may be filed.

14/2/98

File

15/2/98

Office of the Government
Advocate in Mysore
5th February 1898

No. 137

Enclo 1 file of Correspondence

39

Rd 10/2/98

[illegible]

From

The Government Advocate
in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

In continuation of this Office Letter No. 119, dated 10th ultimo, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire file of Correspondence (Record) Connected with the suits filed by one Pattiappa against the Excise Commissioner, in Mysore

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

S Ramaswamiengar
Government Advocate

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಸಮನ್ಸ್.
ಸಿ|| ಪ್ರೊ|| ಕೋಡ ೧೫೯ ವ
೧೬೩ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು.
1
ನಮೂನೆ ನಂಬರ ೧೧, ಸಿವಿಲ್.

[illegible] ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ

ಸನ್ ೧೮೯4/95ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದ ನಂಬರ. 64

[illegible] ವಾದಿ [illegible] ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

[illegible] ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ 4 [illegible] ಯವರಿಗೆ

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ [illegible] [illegible]ಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹಾಜರಾತಿಯು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಇರುವದರಿಂದ ನೀವು ಸನ್ ೧೮೯7ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ~~[illegible] 23 [illegible]~~ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ರೂಬರೂ ಖುದ್ದಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನು ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಯಾವವೆಂದರೆ [illegible] 12 [illegible] 9725–341 [illegible] 212

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ವ ಇತರ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ದಿವಸದ ಭತ್ತೆ ಗಾಗಿ 2—0—0 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಇದರ ಸಂಗತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ನೀವು ಈ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡದು ಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸಿಡ್ಯೂರ್ ಕೋಡಿನ ೧೭೪ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗದೆ ಇರುವಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿ ಇರುವಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ನೋಟೀಸ್.—೧. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕಲ್ಲದೆ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜನ್ನು ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಿಮಿಗೆ ಸಮನ್ಸ್ ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ಸದರೀ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ತಾರೀಖು ವ ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ನೀವು ಸಮನ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಎಣಿಸಲಾಗುವದು.

ಸದರೀ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ತರುವಾಯು ನೀವು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟರ ಆಗ ನಮೂದಾದ ತಾರೀಖಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಒಂದು ದಿನದ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಿಕೆಗೂ ನಿಮಿಗೆ ದರಾಬಲಗು ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಡುವದು.

ಸನ್ ೧೮೯7ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] ಮಾಹೆ 13ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮೊಹರನ್ನಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ದಸ್ತಖತ್ತಿನೊಡನೆ ಕೊಡೋಣಾಗಿದೆ.

DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT

[illegible]

[illegible]

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—28-5-97.—34,402.

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]		
			[illegible]	[illegible]						
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

"Copy"

W. Vincent Day

Pr Excise Commissioner

[illegible]

[illegible]

1894-95 సం॥ [illegible]

వాది [illegible]

ప్రతివాదులు
1. [illegible]
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]

[illegible]

వాది [illegible] 1890 మొదలు 1891 సం॥ [illegible] 53125 [illegible] 1892 సం॥ [illegible] 31 [illegible]

2 వ ప్రతివాది [illegible] 3 వ ప్రతివాది [illegible] 1890 మొదలు 1891 సం॥ [illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible] 5 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

4. [illegible]

[illegible] 13407-14-2 [illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible]

[illegible] 2-3 [illegible] 3 [illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible] 3/ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1893 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 13407-14-2
[illegible]
[illegible] 1-2 [illegible]
2-3 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

"Copy"

Ex-Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

W

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]		[illegible]								[illegible]		
									[illegible]			[illegible]					
			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]									
[illegible]	౯	౨౩	౨౫౪	౫	౩౬౫	౦	౬౮	౫	౦	౧౩	౪	౫౯	౦	౭	౧౦౪౫	౧౦	౭
	౨౪	౩౦	౨౬౧	౮	౩౩౩	౧౫	౬౩౫	౪	౪			౫౨౮	౧౦	౦			
ఉరవకొండ	౧	౧౦	౨౫౪	౧౩	౩౯౩	౧౩	౬౪౩	౬	౪			౫౩౮	౮	౪	౨౫౮	౨	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౪౭	౧౩	౬౩౦	౧౭౫	౮౩౬	౧౧౫				౭౫౯	౪	౪			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౪౨	౫	౬౩౩	౧౪	౮౩౫	౧౮				౭౧౩	౪	౭			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౧౫౮	౨	౨౭౫	౦౫	౪౪౪	౧౫				౩౩౦	౭	౪	౧౮౬౫	౬	౭
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౧౪	౧	౬౦౬	౯	౮౨౦	౧౩				౩౬౩	౨	౭			
	౨౧	౩౦	౩౧౫	౫	౬౩౭	౧౩	౮౮౩	౧౭				౭౨౩	౧౧	౭			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౦౭	౧	౫౭౫	౫	౭౮౩	౩౫				౩౪౪	౫	౦	౩౪౦౬	౩	౦
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౦౮	౬	౬౩౩	౨౨	౮౯	౧౭				౩౭౫	౨౨	౦			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౫౮	౩	౬౯౩	౦	౧౦౫౧	౩				౭౩౬	౨	౦			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౩౦	౦	౬౧౪	౭౫	౮౩౪	౭౫				౩౩౭	౨౨	౪	౨౪౨౭	౬	౦
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౦౮	౬	౫౭౩	౩	౭౯	౮				౩౪౩	౦	౭			
	౨౧	౩౦	౩౩౨	౬	౩౦౫	౧౫	౧౦౭౩	౯				౮౯	౮	౦			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౩౩	౮	౬౩౧	౧౦	౧౦౦౬	౮				౭౩౭	౧౧	౪	౨౩౦౪	౧	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౩౧	౭	౬౩౨	౫	౮౬౩	౧౩				౭౦౩	౦	౭			
	౨౧	౨౭	౨౩౫	౬	౫౫౮	౧౦	౩౮౮	౯				౬౬౨	౫	౪			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౫౭	౯	౬౧౧	౦	౮౭౦	౯				౭౧౩	౪	౭	౨౩౭౮	౧౫	౦
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౫౩	౭	౫౫౩	౫	౮౧౦	౧౩				౩౫౫	౭	౭			
	౨౧	౨౧	౩౮౪	౮	౫౭౮	౧౦	౮౭౪	౮				౭౫	౦	౭			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౭౦	౯	౪౨౦	౧౦	౭౦౧	౬				౬౬౨	౩	౪	౧౮౯౩	౮	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౨౬	౧౧	౪౫౭	౧౦	౩౭౫	౧				౬౫౪	౩	౪			
	౨౧	౩౦	౩౧౫	౭	౫౦౦	౧౦	౭౧౧	౭				౬౩౮	౧౪	౭			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౩౩౦	౯	౫౨౩	౧౦	౭౫౪	౮				౩౨౨	౦	౭	౨౩౭౩	౧	౭
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౩౭	౭	౫౦౫	౧౦	౭౦౩	౧౭				౩౩౯	౮	౪			
	౨౧	౩౧	౪౩౩	౮	౬౪౭	౦	౧౧౨౧	౮				౮౩౪	౩	౭			
[illegible]	౧	౧౦	౪౨౨	౬	౬౨౧	౦	౧౦౪౩	౬				౭౬౮	౬	౭	౨౬౩౬	౧౦	౭
	౧౧	౨౦	౪౦౨	౧౪	౬౫౬	౦	౧౦౩౩	౧౪				౭౮౪	౨	౦			
	౨౧	౩౦	౪౦౪	౦	౬౪౩	౦	౧౦౪౩	౦				౭౩౨	౭	౦			

జూలై	౧	౧౦	౩౬౬	౦	౬౮౬	౦	౧౦౫౭	౦	౮౫౧	౧౦	౮	౨౪౩౭	౧౫	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౭౫	౧౦	౬౨౮	౦	౯౫౩	౧౦	౩౯౪	౯	౪			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౩౯	౧౧	౬౫౭	౧౦	౯౬౭	౧	౮౭౬	౧౧	౪			
ఆగస్టు	౧	౧౦	౨౬౬	౧౦	౬౦౪	౫	౯౦౩	౧౫	౩౫౩	౩	౦	౨౨౪౩	౧	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౭౩	౦	౫౩౭	౫	౮౫౫	౫	౩౭౭	౧౧	౪			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౮౩	౦	౫౫౦	౧౦	౯౩౩	౧౦	౩౮౧	౪	౦			
సెప్టెంబరు	౧	౧౦	౨౯౦	౫	౫౩౦	౧౫	౮౬౧	౦	౩౫	౮	౦	౨౨౨౩	౯	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౬౫	౧౩	౬౫౧	౫	౯౫	౭	౩౬౪	౪	౦			
	౨౧	౩౦	౨౪౬	౧౫	౫౭౮	౫	౩౩౫	౦	౬౪౫	౧౩	౪			
అక్టోబరు	౧	౧౦	౨౩౪	౧	౫౭౩	౧౫	౩౬౧	౫	౬౩౪	౧౩	౫	౧౯౭౩	౧౭	౮
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౫౧	౪	౫౭౩	౦	౩౩౪	౪	౬౪౫	౨	౮			
	౨౧	౩౧	౨౫౧	౧	౫౭౧	౧౦	౩౩౭	౧౧	౬౪౩	౧౧	౮			
నవంబరు	౧	౧౦	౨౬౩	౧౦	౫౪౫	౧౦	౮౦౯	౦	౬౩౪	౨	౮	౧౦౫౮	౧౫	౪
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౩౪	౫	౫౫౮	౧౦	౮౩౭	౧౫	౬౯౩	౧౫	౪			
	౨౧	౩౦	౩౦౧	౧౦	౫౭౩	౧౦	౮౭౯	౦	౬౯౦	౧౩	౪			
డిసెంబరు	౧	౧౦	౩౯౬	౫	౫౫౨	౦	౮౫౬	౫	౩౦౩	౮	౮	౨౨౨౪	౧౭	౮
	౧౧	౨౦	౩౮౭	౧౦	౫౩౫	౧౦	౮౫౮	౦	౩౧౫	౦	౦			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౩౧	౫	౬౭౪	౫	౯౫౫	౧౦	౩౬౬	౪	౦			
జనవరి	౧	౧౦	౩౫౬	౦	౫౫౫	౦	౮౩౧	౦	౨౨౫	౧౩	౪	౨౨౩౧	౧౦	౮
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౫౬	౧౫	౬౩౩	౫	౮౯౦	౦	౩౪౧	౧౦	౮			
	౨౧	౩౦	౨౩౬	౧౦	౬౪౦	౧౦	౯౫	౦	౩౬౪	౨	౮			
ఫిబ్రవరి	౧	౧౦	౨౮౬	౧౦	౫౫౮	౦	౮౪౪	౧౦	౩౦౩	౧౫	౦	౨౦౬౯	౬	౦
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౫౭	౧౦	౫౯౫	౦	౮౪౩	౧౦	౩౦౬	౪	౦			
	౨౧	౨౮	౨౪౮	౦	౫౪౩	౫	౩౯౧	౫	౬౫౯	౯	౦			
మార్చి	౧	౧౦	౨౮౪	౧౦	౫౫౭	౧౦	౮౩౩	౦	౬౯౩	౮	౦	౨౨౫౯	౧౭	౮
	౧౧	౨౦	౨౪౮	౦	౬౧౫	౯	౮౬౩	౦	౩౧౯	౨	౮			
	౨౧	౩౧	౩౦౭	౧౦	౩౦౯	౫	౧౦౧౧	౧౫	౮౪౩	౩	౦			

[illegible] మొత్తం — ౪౧౩౪౧ | ౧ | ౮

[illegible] ౨౨౩౪ [illegible] — ౧౧౧౬ | ౩ | ౦

[illegible] — ౫౩౬౩౧ | ౮ | ౮

[illegible] — ౪౦౨౨౩ | ౧౦ | ౬

[illegible] — ౧౩౪౦౩ | ౧౪ | ౩

[illegible]
[illegible] — 1-4-95.

Copy

[illegible]

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು [illegible]
[illegible]

1894-95ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ [illegible] ನಂಬರು 13

ವಾದಿ.

ಬ. [illegible]

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು

1ನೇ. [illegible]

2ನೇ. [illegible]

ವಾದಿ [illegible]

ವಾದಿ [illegible] 1890 ಮತ್ತು 1891ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ [illegible] 53/25 [illegible] 1892ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ [illegible] 31ನೇ [illegible].

[illegible] 1890 ಮತ್ತು 1891ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ [illegible] 1892ನೇ [illegible] 2ನೇ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ [illegible].

ವಾದಿ [illegible].

[illegible] ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ [illegible] ವಾದಿ [illegible].

[illegible] 2ನೇ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible] 31 [illegible] 17493-15-6 [illegible] —

[illegible] 1892 [illegible] 31 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 17498-16-6
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 1895 [illegible]
[illegible] 23 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 2 [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]

Copy W. Vincent [illegible]
The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

[illegible] 313.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

2. [illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 8/9/90.

[illegible]
[illegible]

(Sd) [illegible]
[illegible]

"Copy"

Sd. Venkata Ramaiyar
Sheristadar
Revenue Commr's Office.

No. $\frac{}{424}$

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar Dated 2nd June 1890.

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

Sir,

No. 1/1 of the 1st April/90
No. 73/17 of the 3rd — do —
No. 641/43 of the 29th — do —

With reference to your dockets as per margin forwarding for disposal petitions from the Toddy Contractors of the Bangalore, Tumkur and Kolar Districts relative to the differences between them on the subject of tapping Shandi trees in the Goribidnur Taluk for the benefit of the adjoining taluks of Maddagiri and Doddaballapur, I have the honor to submit for your information and obliging return when no longer required the accompanying Urzee No. 4 of the 11th Ultimo from the Goribidnur Amildar giving cover to a Kaifeet taken by him from one Seshamma of Kasba Goribidnur who seems to have 17 years' experience in the matter.

It will be observed from the same that the so called mamool set out by the Contractors of Bangalore and Tumkur is not one recognized by

Government or established by prescription, but was only a private arrangement resorted to as experiment by the previous Contractors who had a unity of interest in all the 3 Districts comprised in the late Nundidroog Division. The Separation of that interest in the recent Contract has probably led to the present dispute between the parties.

The question has to be settled by the disputants among themselves, and Government interference in the matter does not appear called for.

I beg to submit that the Contractor Puttrappah of this District cannot in fairness be compelled to allow the Contractors of other Districts to tap trees within the limits of his farm, it being next to impossible for Government to decide that he can do so without any detriment to his own interests.

The Contractors of Bangalore and Tumkur are said to have sufficient date trees in their own taluks to meet their requirements and even if they do stand in real need of help from the Goribidnur taluk it is for them to arrange with Puttrappah for the same in the best way they can.

In case of your concurring in my views I propose to interdict the Contractors of the other Districts interfering with the Toddy trees in this District without the consent of Contractor Pattrappah.

The marginally noted petitions on the subject are enclosed for reference.

(Signed) Abdul Rahaman
Deputy Commissioner
Dy. Kolar District

(Copy)

S. Venkataranga Iyengar
Jt Excise Commr

39

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಸಮನ್ಸ್.
ಶಿ|| ಪ್ರೊ|| ಕೋಡ್ ೧೫೯ ವ
೧೬೩ ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು.

ನಮೂನೆ ನಂಬರ್. ೧೦, ಶಿವಿಲ್.

[illegible] ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಸನ 1894/95 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದ ನಂಬರ್. 64.

[illegible] ವಾದಿ [illegible] ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

[illegible] ಸ್ಥಳದ 17 [illegible]

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ [illegible] ಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹಾಜರಾತಿಯು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಇರುವದರಿಂದ ನೀವು ಸನ 1897 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] 1 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವಾನ್ಹ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ರೂಬರೂ ಖುದ್ದಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಯಾವವಂದರೆ— [illegible] 12 [illegible] 9725-34/212 [illegible]

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ವ ಇತರ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ದಿವಸದ ಭತ್ತೆಗಾಗಿ 2-0-0 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಇದರ ಸಂಗತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿಧೆ ನೀವು ಈ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡದು ಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಶಿವಿಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸಿಡ್ಯೂರ್ ಕೋಡಿನ ೧೭೪ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗದೆ ಇರುವಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿ ಇರುವಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ನೋಟೀಸ.—೧. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕಲ್ಲದೆ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜನ್ನ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಿಮಿಗೆ ಸಮನ್ಸ ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ಸದರೀ ದಸ್ತಾವೇಜನ್ನ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ತಾರೀಖು ವ ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ನೀವು ಸಮನ್ಸ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆದು ಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಎಣಿಸಲಾಗುವದು.

ಸದರೀ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ತರುವಾಯ ನೀವು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಆಗ ನಮೂದಾದ ತಾರೀಖಾದ ವೇಳೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಒಂದು ದಿವದ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಿಕೆಗೂ ನಿಮಿಗೆ ನೋಟಲಗು ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಡುವದು.

ಸನ 1897 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ [illegible] ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ 15 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮೊಹರಿನ ಸಮೇತ ದಸ್ತಖತಿನ ಜತೆ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಾಗಿಧೆ.

HUNDIDROOG DIVISION

By order

[illegible] ಜಡ್ಜ್.

Shiristadar

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—5-7-95.—1,35,002.

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

In Continuation of our addre
Nos 10 & 7 dated 15th & 18th instant respectively I beg to Submit that you will be pleased to give your Kind and earliest Consideration to the following facts.

It has been intimated to me and the toddy Contractor of Kolar that the export of toddy from Goribidnur Taluk of Kolar District to Doddaballapur, Hoskote and Davenhally Taluks of Bangalore District was no mamool, but such Conclusion was arrived at without having held any enquiry in the presence of both parties. Upon the receipt of such decision the Toddy Contractor of Kolar has suddenly stopped my subrenters, ~~from~~, drawing and conveying toddy as usual from Goribidnur Taluk and I am thereby subjected to a great loss. The export of toddy above referred to has been a long standing one as there are no sufficient date trees in Doddaballapur and other Taluks for their toddy supplies which fact I am prepared to prove by the late Subrenters, toddy drawers and accounts. I further beg that you will be good enough to refer to para 8 of the Rules laid down for the Contractors in the Dewan's Notification calling upon tenders for toddy Contract of different Districts in which the Government has reserved the right of keeping aside any date trees or topes for cultivation or other purposes or for the supply of toddy for other taluks without giving the

On the force of such rule I have agreed to pay to Government for the Bangalore District a very large sum trusting that I shall not be hindered from importing toddy from mamool topes. I therefore beg that you will be so good as to fix a day for the settlement of the question calling upon both parties to produce evidence in the matter and favor us a final decision and in the meantime I beg that you will be good enough to telegraph both to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar and the toddy Contractor of that District not to prevent my subrenters and servants from drawing and conveying toddy as usual until the final settlement of the subject

I have &c

Mysore
20th July/90

(Sd) V. D. Papanna

Memo No. 2019/92.

Forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar. There has not been an enquiry on this subject in the presence of the parties Concerned. The under-signed will hold a local enquiry on a day to be fixed hereafter after consulting the Convenience of the Contractors of Bangalore, Kolar and Tumkur. In the meantime, the Contractor of Goribidnore will, without objection, permit, as during the late Contract, the exportation of Toddy to Dodballapur and to Muddigiri. The point will be disposed of as soon as possible

(Sd) R. Vijayendra Rao
Excise Commissioner

Monday
21/22 July 1890

"Copy"

T. Venkatachal Iyengar
[illegible]
Excise Commnr's Office

D O

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore
Bangalore 19th November 1896.

My dear Sir

You know I presume there are two big suits for 17 thousand & odd cash pending against Govt in connection with Pattrappa's toddy contract of Kolar District

In this connection evidence will have to be adduced to shew

(1) that there was necessity & mamool for supply from Goribidnur to Doddaballapoor and Maddagiri

(2) that Patrappa in spite of supply as above did obtain sufficient supply for himself from Gouribidnore groves and that he did not suffer any loss on account of, and in consequence of supply to Bangalore

and Tumkur Districts i,e in other words that he had sufficient supply from the groves for himself notwithstanding supply from those groves elsewhere

Kindly enquire into what evidence is available on these points and whether there are any persons forthcoming who could give evidence on these points After collecting information if Mr Abdul Aziz could be spared for a day and if you think he could throw any light on the evidence in case kindly send him to Bangalore to see me and the Government Advocate for a day

(Signed) Yours very sincerely
P.N. Purnaiah

P.S. The case is posted for 1st December & the list of witnesses if any has to be filed at least on the 25th Instant. So informati must be ready if any by 24th instant.

Sd. P.N.S.

C. Madaiah Esqr. }
Deputy Commr: }

No: 792

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Supervisor Chickaballapur Range for information with a direction that he would report on all the points required by the Excise Commissioner by ~~return of post~~ as early as possible.

Dated 20th Nov: }
1896 }

for Dy Commissioner

Received
22 November '96

Doddaballapur: Narnappa - Annappa - Chitter Muniyappa residing at Chickballapur

Submitted Sir,

I respectfully beg to report that on receipt of the above orders yesterday I at once proceeded to Goribidnur and after making necessary enquiries was able to procure the following men who would give evidence to the effect that as Mamool toddy was or is being exported to Doddaballapur and Madagiri Taluqs from Goribidnur and that during the tenure of Pattarappa's Contract his supply had not fallen short of on this account. Further I beg to state that the Abkari Inspectors Gundu Rao and Lingappa of Mulubagal and Maddagiri Taluqs respectively have a personal knowledge of this affair as they were in employment under Nelgiri Papanna & other Contractors prior to their entertainment in the Government Service.

For Doddaballapur Taluq

1. Bestha Narmappa
2. Chithur Muniyappa } residing at Chickballapur
3. Annappa

Ram. Rev. Insp. Goribidnur

For Maddagiri Taluq

1. Talathimmanahalli Hanumanthu - Eadig.
2. Chowlur - Yerrappa - Eadiga
3. Kudgathur Koanda
4. Dodda Kurgoadu Chickappaiah

All reside at Goribidnur

(To avoid delay summons to these men may be sent to the Inspectors (Abkari) of the Goribidnur Taluq for service as all of them

In the Court of the District Judge
Nandidroog Division

O.S. No 64 of 1894-95.

Plaintiff
B. Pathrappa

vs

Defendants.
1 Excise Commissioner
2. Hottay Rhungamma
3. Kenchammah.

Written statement of the 1st Defendant.

1. No suit lies against the Government.

2. The Plaintiff's suit is not maintainable under section 225 of the Revenue Code as he has not exhausted all his remedies. 1st Defendant is no party to the suit.

3. There is no cause of action as against the 1st Defendant.

4

5 ~~4~~ Government d[illegible]ot give exclusive possession of date groves in the Talugs of Gowribidnoor, Goodibunda, Bagepall, Chickballapoor & Siddlaghatta as alleged by Plaintiff. This allegation of Plaintiff is opposed to Condition 8 of the Lease.

6. ~~5~~ 2nd Defendant & the 3rd Defendants

deceased husband [illegible]

wrongly extract toddy from the trees in the Goribidnoor Taluq and remove the same to Tumkur & this is provided for in Condition 8 of the Lease. It is usual for the Tumkur Contractors to transport toddy from the groves in the Goribidnoor Taluq.

7 ~~6~~. The Deputy Commissioner's order was not approved by the Excise Commissioner who cancelled the order & did allow the 2nd Defendant & the 3rd Defendant's deceased husband to transport toddy pending further enquiry and settlement.

8 ~~7~~. The Excise Commissioner finally settled that the Plaintiff was not entitled to compensation as it was usual for the Tumkur Contractors to transport toddy from the Goribidnoor Taluq & that the Plaintiff was not entitled to compensation as per Condition 8 of the Lease.

9 ~~8~~. The Plaintiff having agreed to be bound by the settlement of the Excise Commissioner & the Excise Commissioner having settled it, the Plaintiff is estopped from bringing the suit.

10 ~~9~~. The Government is not in any way liable in damages, & the amount of damages claimed is excessive and the principle on which the damages have been estimated is wrong.

11. The Plaint as regards the 1st Defendant should be dismissed with costs.

4. The plaint discloses no cause of action inasmuch as under the Notification of 25th January 90 the Plaintiff was only entitled to extract toddy for sale within the limits of his own farm and he nowhere distinctly alleges that by reason of the transport of toddy by Defendants 2 and 3 the supply of toddy to his own farm proved insufficient. He had no right to extract toddy or sell it for use outside the limits of his own farm —

I, 1st Dft above named do declare that what is ~~stated~~ herein is true to the best of my inform & belief —

1 No suit lies against the Govt

2. The Pff's suit is not maintainable under Sec of the Rev Code as he has not exhausted all his remedies.

1st Dft is no party to the suit.

3. There is no cause of action as agt the 1st Dft

4. Govt did not give exclusive possn of date groves in the Taluqs of Gowribidnur × as alleged by Pff — This allegation of Pff is opposed to condition 8 of the Lease

× Gowribidnur
Bayenhally
Chikkaballapur &
Sidlaghatta

5 2d Dft did not wrongly extract toddy from the trees ~~of~~ in the Gowribidnur Taluq to Bang: & this is provided for in condition 8 of the Lease

It is usual for the Bangalore Contractors to transport toddy from the approved ~~[illegible]~~ groves in the Gowribidnur Taluq

6 The DyComr's orders was not appealed

Bang

[illegible]

by the Excise Commr who Cancelled the order & did allow the 2d Deft. to transport toddy pending further enquiry & settlement.

The Excise Commr finally settled that the Plff was not entitled to Compensation as it was usual for the Bangalore Contractors to transport toddy from the Gowribidnur Taluq & that the Plff was not entitled to Compensation as per Condition 8 of the lease -

The Plff having agreed to be bound by the settlement of the Excise Commr & the Excise Commr having settled it the Plff is estopped from bring this suit

The Govt is not in any way
acct of
in
liable ~~for~~ damages & the damages claimed is excessive —

Bang

In the Court of the D.J.
Secundry Dn
No 63994-95

Plff Dyts

Palaniappen TV Executors

24th Septr 96

4 December 96

O.S. No 64/94-95 Tumkur

Plff
Pallerappa

Dfts
Vs 1 Spencer Co
2. Hollay Anganna
3 Kenchamma

1, 2, 3 & 4 grounds are same

5 2d Dft & the 3d Dft's deceased husband Chikkamallea did not wrongly extract honey from the trees in the Gombedurs belong to Tumkur & this is provided for in condition 8 of the Lease. It is usual for the Tumkur Contractors to transport honey from the genes in the Gombedurs belong

6 × × ×

I did allow the 2d & 3d Dfts deceased husband

7 × × ×

Tumkur Contracts

O.S. No 63 Bang: Distt

Pltff
Pattaiyappa

Vs

Defts
1 Excise Commr
2. Lord Pafounk.

Eg: Cases Notes

wanted to make a spl mention

Dod Rajamma the Contractor of the Dt of Bang: was an inimical terms with Chik Mallia contractor of the Tumkur Dt, so that they wanted the Method of drawing Toddy of Kunigal Tk of Tumkur Dt to Bangalore

Jumparma Kuruyana Contractor of Hassan Dt ~~and~~ was afraid of supply of Toddy from Kud[redacted] to a spl mention to be made

This was done at the spl request of those 2 Contractors

In the Court of the District Judge
Nundidroog Division

O.S. No 63 of 1894-95

Plaintiff		Defendants
B. Puthrappa	Vs.	1. Excise Commissioner 2. Dodda Papanna

Under instructions from the Govern:ment, I the 1st Defendant abovenamed do hereby retain & appoint Mr S Ramaswamy Iyer Asstt Govt Advocate, to appear & conduct the defence on my behalf & I shall abide by all such acts as the said Mr Ramaswamy Iyer may do or cause to be done on my behalf in the above Cause

Bangalore
26th November 95

S Ricketts
Excise Commr

Accepted
Ramaswamy
Asstt

In the Court of the District Judge
Nundidroog Division

O.S. No 64 of 1894-95

Plaintiff — Defendants
B. Pattorappa Vs. 1. Excise Commissioner
2. Hottay Rangamma
3. Kenchammah

Under instructions from the Government, I the 1st Defendant above-named do hereby retain & appoint Mr S. Ramaswamy Iyer, Assistant Govt Advocate, to appear & conduct the defence on my behalf & I shall abide by all such acts as the said Mr Ramaswamy Iyer may do or cause to be done on my behalf in the above cause

Bangalore
26 November 95

J. Ricketts
Excise Commr

Accepted

Written Statement of the 1. Defendant (Excise Commr) in original Civil Suit No. 64 of 1894-95 on the file of the District Judge of [illegible] Division.

1 It is a well known fact that all the Taluks in the [illegible] do not contain date groves, and that therefore they are not self-supporting as regards the supply of Toddy, & that many taluks are consequently dependent for the supply of Toddy upon other taluks in the same district or different districts.

2 ~~The [illegible] of the~~ Parts of the [illegible] taluk in the Kurnool district ~~[illegible] of the [illegible] taluk~~ have always been dependent for the supply of Toddy upon the groves in the Koilkuntla taluk.

3 The conditions of the Toddy Contract for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892 referred to in the Plaint of Pattabhiram, are laid down in the Govt. Notifn.x dated 25th January 1890, from which it will be seen that the Contractors' right was exclusive only as regards the vend of Toddy within the respective taluks.

x a copy is herewith sent for ready reference.

4 It is not true, as alleged by Plaintiff, that Mr. Rickett, the Excise Commr. did not dispose of the Plaintiff's complaint. It was ascertained that the supply of Toddy from the Koilkuntla taluk to the above mentioned Taluk ~~[illegible]~~ in the Kurnool district was of absolute necessity, ~~the said taluks~~ the said taluk not being self-supporting; and that the practice of transporting Toddy from the Koilkuntla taluk

has therefore always existed. It is clear from the aforesaid Govt. [illegible] that the Contractor was not given the exclusive privilege of tapping all the trees in the [illegible] taluk. As laid down in Condition VIII in [illegible] of the said letter, the Govt. had full liberty at any time to reserve the date trees in any taluk for the supply of Toddy to the [illegible]. Accordingly the Revenue Comr. as the Representative of Govt. allowed Toddy to be drawn from the gardens in the [illegible] taluk referred to by the Plaintiff for supply to the aforesaid taluk in the ~~[illegible]~~ district. As per Condition VIII the Plaintiff is not entitled to any compensation on account of the Toddy drawn from the said gardens. Accordingly the said Comr. Mr. [illegible] in his [illegible] Resn. No. 124 of 8th [illegible] 1593 & communicated to the Plaintiff Particularly, a copy of the Res[illegible] is herewith appended.

Under the above circumstances the undersigned submits that the suit deserves to be dismissed with costs.

Written Statement of the 1st Defendant (Excise Commr.) in original Civil Suit No. 63 of 1894-95 on the file of the District Judge, Nundidroog Division.

1 It is a well known fact that all the Taluks in the Mysore province do not contain date groves, and that therefore they are not self-supporting ~~[illegible]~~ as regards the supply of Toddy, and that many taluks are consequently ~~[illegible]~~ dependent for the supply of Toddy upon other taluks in the same District or different Districts.

2 The taluks of Dodballapur & Devanhalli and parts of the Hoskote taluk have always been dependent for the supply of Toddy upon the ~~[illegible]~~ groves in the Goribidnur taluk.

3 The conditions of the Toddy Contract ~~[illegible]~~ for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892, referred to in the plaint of Pattappa, are laid down in the Govt. Notifn.x dated 25th January 1890, from which it will be seen that the Contractor's right was ~~exclusive~~ only as regards the vend ~~[illegible]~~ of Toddy within the respective taluks.

x A copy is herewith sent for ready reference.

4 ~~[illegible]~~ It is not true, as alleged by Plaintiff, that ~~[illegible]~~ Lt.-[illegible] or the "Excise Commr." did not dispose of the Plaintiff's dispute. It was ascertained ~~[illegible]~~ that the supply of Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk to the above mentioned taluks in the Bangalore District was of absolute necessity, ~~and that such supply was an established usage~~ the said taluks not being self-supporting; & that ~~such supply~~ the practice of transporting Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk has always existed ~~there from become established~~. It is clear from the aforesaid Govt. Notifn. that the Contractor ~~was~~ not given the exclusive privilege of tapping all the trees in the Goribidnur taluk. As laid down in Condition VIII ~~[illegible]~~ in para 7 of the said notification, ~~[illegible]~~ the Govt. had full liberty at any time

to reserve the date trees in any taluk for the supply of Toddy to other taluks. Accordingly, the Excise Commr. as the Representative of Govt. ~~[illegible]~~ allowed Toddy to be drawn from the groves ~~[illegible]~~ in the [illegible] taluk, reserved by the Plaintiff for supply to the aforesaid taluks in the [illegible] district. ~~[illegible]~~ As per said Condition VIII the Plaintiff is not entitled to any compensation on account of the Toddy Trees tapped from the said groves. Accordingly, the Excise Commr. passed his decision in his Off. Lr. E. 124/8, d/ 8th July 1893, and communicated the same to Plaintiff Patrabhola, a copy whereof is herewith appended.

5 Under the above circumstances the undersigned submits that the suit ~~[illegible]~~ deserves to be dismissed with costs.

Sd/

Excise Comr.

In the Court of the District Judge
Nundidroog Division
O.S. No: 63 of 1894—95

Plaintiff — Defendants
B. Pattarappa VS 1. Excise Commissioner
2. Dod Papamma

Written statement of the 1st Defendant

1 No Suit lies against the Government

2. The Plaintiff's suit is not maintainable under Section 225 of the Revenue Code as he has not exhausted all his remedies. 1st Defendant is no party to the Suit.

3 There is no cause of action as against the 1st Defendant.

4 The plaint discloses no cause of action in as much as under the notification of 25th January 1890 the Plaintiff was only entitled to extract Toddy for sale within the limits of his own farm and he no where distinctly alleges that by reason of the transport of Toddy by 2nd Defendant the supply of Toddy to his own farm proved insufficient. He had no right to extract

toddy or sell it for use outside the limits of his own farm.

5 Government did not give exclusive possession of date groves in the Taluqs of Goribidnoor, Gudibanda, Bagenhully, Chickaballapoor and Sidlaghatta as alleged by Plaintiff. This allegation of Plaintiff is opposed to the condition 8 of the Lease.

6 2nd. Defendant did not wrongly extract toddy from the trees in the Goribidnoor Taluq and remove the same to Bangalore District and this is provided for in condition 8 of the Lease. It is usual for the Bangalore District Contractors to transport toddy from the groves in the Goribidnoor Taluq.

7 The Deputy Commissioner's Order was not approved by the Excise Commissioner who cancelled the order and did allow the 2nd. Defendant to transport toddy pending ~~further~~ enquiry and settlement.

. The Excise Commissioner finally settled that the Plaintiff was not entitled to compensation as it was usual for the angalore District Contractors to transport toddy from the Goribidnoor Taluq that the as per condition 8 of the Lease.

9 The Plaintiff having agreed to be bound by the Settlement of the Excise Commissioner and the Excise Commissioner having settled it, the Plaintiff is estopped from bringing the Suit.

10 The Government is not in any way liable in damages, and the principle on which the damages have been estimated is wrong. The amount of damages claimed is excessive.

11 The plaint as regards the 1st Defendant should be dismissed with costs.

(Sd) L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

I, L. Ricketts, Excise Commissioner abovenamed do declare that what is stated herein is true to the best of my information and belief.

Bangalore
1st October 1895

(Sd) L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

In the Court of the District Judge
Nundidroog Division

O.S. No: 64 of 1894-95

Plaintiff	Defendants
B. Pathrappa	1. Excise Commissioner 2. Hottay Rangamma 3. Kenchammah

Written Statement of the 1st Defendant

1. No Suit lies against the Defendant.

2. The Plaintiff's Suit is not maintainable under Section 225 of the Revenue Code as he has not exhausted all his remedies. 1st Defendant is no party to the Suit.

3 There is no cause of action as against the 1st Defendant.

4 The plaint discloses no cause of action in as much as under the Notification of 25th January 1890 the Plaintiff was only entitled to extract toddy for sale within the limits of his own farm and he no where distinctly alleges that by reason of the transport of toddy by Defendants 2 and 3 the supply of toddy to his own farm proved insufficient. He had no right to extract toddy or sell it

for use outside the limits of his own farm.

5 Government did not give exclusive possession of date groves in the Taluqs of Goribidnoor, Gudibanda, Bagepully, Chickaballapur and Sidlaghatta as alleged by Plaintiff. This allegation of Plaintiff is opposed to condition 8 of the Lease.

6 2nd Defendant and the 3rd Defendant's deceased husband Chikamalliah did not wrongly extract toddy from the trees in the Goribidnoor taluk and remove the same to Tumkur and this is provided for in condition 8 of the Lease. It is usual for the Tumkur Contractors to transport toddy from the groves in the Goribidnoor Taluqs.

7. The Deputy Commissioner's order was not approved by the Excise Commissioner who cancelled the order and did allow the 2nd Defendant and the 3rd Defendant's deceased husband to transport toddy pending further enquiry and settlement.

8 The Excise Commissioner finally

entitled to compensation as it was usual for the Tunkar Contractors to transport toddy from the Goribidnur taluq and that the Plaintiff was not entitled to compensation as per condition 8 of the Lease.

9 The Plaintiff having agreed to be bound by the Settlement of the Excise Commissioner and the Excise Commissioner having settled it the Plaintiff is estopped from bringing this suit.

10 The Government is not in any way liable in damages and the principle on which the damages have been estimated is wrong. The amount of damages claimed is excessive.

11 The Plaint as regards the 1st Defendant should be dismissed with costs

(Sd) L. Ricketts
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To [illegible]

The Revenue Secretary

39

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that Patrappa, late Toddy Contractor of the Gowribidnur Circle consisting of the taluks of Gowribidnur, Chikballapur, Bagepalli and Sidlaghatta in the Kolar District, for a period of two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892, has filed two suits in the District Court of Nundydroog, as per particulars in the margin, making Excise Commr the 1st defendant.

X No. 63 of 1894-95}
Plaintiff—
Patrappa
Defendants—
1 Excise Commr
2 Dodda Papamma

No. 64 of 1894-95}
~~Patrappa~~
Plaintiff—
Patrappa
Defendants—
1 Excise Commr
2 Hottay Rangamma
3 Ramchamma

2 The summonses have been duly served on me, and the cases have been posted for hearing on the 23rd & 24th July 1895

~~[illegible]~~ As gathered from the copies of the Plaints received with the Ammendments, the Suits have been filed on the following grounds:—

(1) that Plaintiff was the Toddy Contractor of the taluks of Gowribidnur, Chickballapur, Bagepalli & Sidlaghatta taluks, in the Kolar District for two years from 1st April 1890 to 31st March 1892,

(2) that the date groves belonging to the above taluks were in his exclusive possession & ~~[illegible]~~ enjoyment during the above period

(3) that the Toddy Contractors Dodda Papanna & Chick Lakka of the Bangalore & Tumkur Districts, respectively, for the aforesaid two years, removed Toddy from ~~[illegible]~~ certain groves in the Gowribidnur taluk to their respective districts without his consent on the plea that it was always usual for the Bangalore & Tumkur districts to obtain Toddy from the Gowribidnur taluk;

(4) that he complained about their act to the ~~[illegible]~~ Dy. Commr. of the Kolar ~~[illegible]~~ District & the late Excise Commr. [illegible]

(5) that the Dy. Commr. decided that the Contractors of the Bangalore and Kolar districts had no right to draw Toddy from the groves in the Gowribidnur taluk.

(6) but that the Excise Commr. ordered that until he finally settled the dispute ~~[illegible]~~ after making a local

~~[illegible]~~ the requisite quantity of Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk an accurate account of such transactions being kept by both parties

(7) that the late Excise Commr. Mr. Vijayaraghavalu never settled the dispute, & afterwards he died;

(8) that his successor Mr. Griffiths also did not settle the dispute

(9) that ~~the [illegible]~~ Doddaballapur ~~and~~ Chickballapur having obtained supplies of Toddy from the Goribidnur taluk, according to the accounts maintained by both parties, he (Plaintiff) claims Rupees 17493-15-6 (?) on account of the Bangalore district, & Rs. 13407-14-2 on account of the Tumkur district

4 It is a ~~[illegible] facts of the case are briefly the following: It is a~~ well known fact that most of the taluks in the province are dependent ~~upon~~ for Toddy supply upon other taluks in the same district or different districts. According to the established usage, the contractors of the Bangalore district ~~[illegible]~~ obtained ~~the requisite~~ from the Goribidnur taluk the requisite quantity of Toddy for the taluks of ~~[illegible]~~, Dodballapur, Devanhalli & Hoskote, & the contractor of the Tumkur district likewise obtained it for the Maddagiri ~~taluk~~ Pateappah, the contractor of the Goribidnur circle complained that the contractors of the Bangalore & Tumkur districts had no right to obtain Toddy from the Goribid

Taluk. The Dy Comr Kolar District in his letter No 662/424, d/ 2d June 1890, reported ~~[illegible]~~ that the right set up by the Tody Contractors of the Bangalore and Tumkur Districts to convey Tody from the Goribednur Taluk was not one recognized by Govt. or established by preoccupation, but was only a private arrangement made by the former Contractors who had a unity of interest in all the three districts consequent in the late renting system. As this report was based mainly upon a deposition taken by the Amildar of Goribednur from one [illegible] who was apparently interested in the Contractor of the Goribednur circle, the late Excise Comr replied to the Dy Comr as follows. "There "has not been an enquiry on this subject in "the presence of the parties concerned. The "Excise Comr will hold a local enquiry on a "day to be fixed hereafter, after consulting the "convenience of the Contractors of Bangalore "Kolar & Tumkur. In the meantime the "Contractor of Goribednur will, without "objection, permit, as during the late "contract, the exportation of Tody to "Doddaballapur & Maddigiri. The point "will be disposed of as soon as possible."

5 On the representations of the Contractors of the Bangalore & Tumkur districts that it was an established custom to carry Tody from the Goribednur taluk, & that

until the dispute [illegible]
"the following procedure shall be adopted:
"(1) The requisite toddy shall for the
"present be transported to the Maddagiri
"taluk in the Tumkur district, &
"Doddaballapur, Devanhalli &
"Hoskote taluks in the Bangalore
"district.
"(2) Until the settlement of the dispute
"[illegible], the Contractor of the Goribidnur
"circle shall keep an account
"showing the toddy transported to the
"above taluks, & send a copy of
"it to the Excise Commr as well as
"to the Contractors of the Bangalore &
"Tumkur districts.
"(3) If the dispute be decided in favour
"of Mr Ratnabbah, the amounts due to
"him shall be paid by the Contractors
"of the Bangalore & Tumkur districts

6 ~~As~~ Though the late Excise Commr did not make
a local enquiry, yet he seems to have questioned
several old Contractors of the various districts
and satisfied himself that the supply of
toddy from the Goribidnur taluk to the
aforesaid taluks was of absolute necessity,
~~as~~ that according[ly] it was always transported
and that therefore it was ~~safe~~ established ~~[illegible]~~
usage to do so. Such usage has been
followed under the present new Toddy
scheme also, the requisite supplies of
toddy for the Doddaballapur & Devanhalli
taluks in the Bangalore dt, & the
Maddagiri taluk in the Tumkur
district, being obtained from the Goribidnur
taluk

taluk but for supply of Toddy to the Hoskota taluk, however, other arrangements have been made on account of the great distance of the date groves in the Goribednore taluk from Hoskota. Thus it is conclusively clear ~~is also clear that~~ the aforesaid taluks have always been dependent upon the Goribednore taluk for supplies of Toddy.

7 It ~~is~~ was also one of the conditions of the aforesaid two years' Toddy Contract which closed on 31st March 1892 as laid down in Condition ~~VIII~~ of the Toddy Contract dated 4th of 25th January 1890, that the Contractor could have no claim to compensation on account of any date trees or topes which the Govt. might at any time, consider necessary to ~~reserve~~ for the supply of Toddy to other Taluks.

8 On Petitioner presenting a petition to me in June 1893, I gave him an endorsement on the 8th July 1893, ~~[illegible]~~ setting forth ~~that~~ the above said grounds, and stating that he could claim no compensation for the Toddy transported from the Goribednore taluk to meet the requirements of the Tumkur & Bangalore districts. ~~It will thus [illegible]~~

9 Two statements setting forth the grounds of defence, are herewith

may be passed for the costs of the defence, so far as the Excise Court is concerned, being borne by Government.

Excise & S.

Ag. Secy

Excise Comr

Nundydroog Division.

O.S. No: 64 of 1894-95.

Plaintiff — Defendants

B. Pattnappa ~~vs~~ 1. The Excise Commissioner of Mysore.
2. Hottay Rangamma
3 Kenchamma

Issues.—

I Is the present suit maintainable against the 1st Defendant or Government?

II Has the plaintiff exhausted all the remedies available to him and is the suit barred under Section 225 of the Land Revenue Code?

III Is the suit barred by Statute of Limitation?

IV Was the plaintiff competent to dispose of toddy outside the limits leased by him from Government

V. Was the plaintiff by mamool or otherwise to the exclusive privilege of drawing toddy from all the trees in his Talugs? Was he given exclusive possession of all the trees standing within his Talugs?

VI. Were the 2nd defendant and his brother as lessees of the Tumkur District entitled to draw toddy from the trees included in the plaintiffs farm by right of mamool or otherwise?

VII Did the 2nd defendant and his deceased brother take toddy from the plaintiffs groves (vanās) and use it for the whole of the District or only for the Turkas of Kadagathoor and Kodegehully as pleaded by them?

VIII. Was toddy so taken by the 2d defendant and his deceased brother or their Sub-Contractors.

IX. What was the quantity and value of the toddy taken by the 2 defendants and his deceased brother Chuck Malliah or their Sub-contractors?

X Did the 2d defendant and his brother agree to take toddy from the plaintiffs' Talug on the terms set forth in the plaint?

XI Is the plaintiff entitled to claim any Compensation for loss incurred, if any, since the decision of the Excise Commissioner has been adverse to him?

XII Is the plaintiff estopped from claiming any damages and bring up the present suit?

XIII If toddy was taken and used by the defendants' sub-contractors, can the defendants 2 and 3 be held liable for the loss, if any, caused by the acts of their sub-contractors?

XIV To what relief, if any, is the plaintiff entitled and against whom?

XV The plaintiff having sub leased his farm, is he entitled to maintain the present suit?

(Signed) S. R. Subbaraya Iyer
Ag: District Judge

Copy

Ag: District Judge